



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

54

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,816	11/06/2001	Felipe Gomez	BOC9-2001-0040 (285)	5663

7590

05/11/2005

Gregory A. Nelson,
Akerman Senterfitt
222 Lakeview Avenue, Fourth Floor
P.O. Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

SKED, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2655

DATE MAILED: 05/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/992,816	Applicant(s) GOMEZ, FELIPE	
	Examiner Matthew J Sked	Art Unit 2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments, in view of the amendments, with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Baker (U.S. Pat. 6,122,613).

As per claims 1 and 12, Ortega teaches a system for displaying speech recognition system information comprising:

providing a single floating window (col. 2, lines 43-44) for displaying frames of speech recognition state information to a user (views with display commands, col. 2, lines 8-12);

frames differ from other frames according to speech recognition speech state information (dictation state views have dictation commands and text editing state view has text editing commands, col. 2, lines 12-18 and lines 59-61);

varying said frames according to trigger events detected in the speech recognition system (views are present when such functionality is available and hence a

state change trigger must inherently be present to indicate the availability of this functionality, col. 2, lines 61-63); and

wherein the frames variably displayed in the single floating window include a frame containing a list of valid speech recognition commands for a current speech recognition system state (dictation state views have dictation commands, col. 2, lines 12-18).

Ortega does not specifically teach including a frame containing a list of alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed.

Baker teaches a speech recognition system with a graphic user interface with a window that contains a word choice history window that allows the user to choose alternate text selections from a previously spoken word (col. 1, line 48 to col. 2, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to contain a list of alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed as taught by Baker because this would give the user choices to facilitate the correction of misrecognized speech.

4. Regarding claims 2 and 13, Ortega teaches detecting a trigger event in said speech recognition system and dynamically update single floating window according to said trigger event (dictation stops, col. 2, lines 16-18).

5. As per claims 3 and 14, Ortega teaches each trigger event specifying one frame from a plurality of context-dependent frames (when functionality is available the

corresponding view is present, views differ according to the types of commands that are available and hence are context dependent, col. 2, lines 61-63).

6. As per claims 4 and 15, Ortega teaches the context dependent frame includes items of speech recognition system state information (text editing commands, Fig. 1, elements 22).

7. As per claims 5 and 16, Ortega suggests determining the speech recognition state information to be included in said context dependent frame corresponding to said detected trigger event (selecting list of commands to display corresponding to the frame, col. 3, lines 5-9).

8. As per claims 6 and 17, Ortega teaches the trigger event to be a change in the operational state of the speech recognition system (a state change would have to occur in the system for a new functionality to become available, col. 2, lines 61-63).

9. As per claims 7 and 18, Ortega teaches the speech recognition state information to be a list of available speech commands (list of commands, col. 2, lines 43-46).

Ortega does not specifically teach the speech recognition state information to be alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed.

Baker teaches a speech recognition system with a graphic user interface with a window that contains a word choice history window that allows the user to choose alternate text selections from a previously spoken word (col. 1, line 48 to col. 2, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to contain a list of alternative text selections for

Art Unit: 2655

a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed as taught by Baker because this would give the user choices to facilitate the correction of misrecognized speech.

Ortega and Baker do not teach the speech recognition state information to be a list of commands previously issued by a user.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that a command history is notoriously well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega and Baker so the speech recognition state information to be a list of commands previously issued by a user because it would allow frequent commands to be displayed more prominently for the user.

10. As per claim 8, Ortega teaches a single graphical interface configured to:

display all context dependent frames of selected items of speech recognition system state information in a speech recognition system (plurality of views available to display and so must inherently be configured to display them, col. 2, lines 8-18); and

dynamically present selected ones of said plurality of context dependent frames responsive to at least one trigger event (views are present when such functionality is available and hence a trigger must inherently be present to indicate the availability of this functionality, col. 2, lines 61-63); and

wherein the frames variably displayed in the single floating window include a frame containing a list of valid speech recognition commands for a current speech

recognition system state (dictation state views have dictation commands, col. 2, lines 12-18).

Ortega does not specifically teach including a frame containing a list of alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed.

Baker teaches a speech recognition system with a graphic user interface with a window that contains a word choice history window that allows the user to choose alternate text selections from a previously spoken word (col. 1, line 48 to col. 2, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to contain a list of alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed as taught by Baker because this would give the user choices to facilitate the correction of misrecognized speech.

11. As per claim 9, Ortega teaches the speech recognition state information to be a list of available speech commands (list of commands, col. 2, lines 43-46).

Ortega does not specifically teach the speech recognition state information to be alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed.

Baker teaches a speech recognition system with a graphic user interface with a window that contains a word choice history window that allows the user to choose alternate text selections from a previously spoken word (col. 1, line 48 to col. 2, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to contain a list of alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed as taught by Baker because this would give the user choices to facilitate the correction of misrecognized speech.

Ortega and Baker do not teach the speech recognition state information to be a list of commands previously issued by a user.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that a command history is notoriously well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega and Baker so the speech recognition state information to be a list of commands previously issued by a user because it would allow frequent commands to be displayed more prominently for the user.

12. As per claim 10, Ortega teaches the trigger event to be a change in the operational state of the speech recognition system (a change would have to occur in the system for a new functionality to become available, col. 2, lines 61-63).

13. As per claim 11, Ortega teaches a single graphical interface configured to:
a primary view and a separate single graphical user interface (a GUI having a separate window, col. 2, lines 43-44).

display all context dependent frames of selected items of speech recognition system state information in a speech recognition system (plurality of views available to display and so inherently must be configured to display them, col. 2, lines 8-18); and

dynamically present selected ones of said plurality of context dependent frames responsive to at least one trigger event (views are present when such functionality is available and hence a trigger must be present to indicate the availability of this new functionality, col. 2, lines 61-63); and

wherein the frames variably displayed in the single floating window include a frame containing a list of valid speech recognition commands for a current speech recognition system state (dictation state views have dictation commands, col. 2, lines 12-18).

Ortega does not specifically teach including a frame containing a list of alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed.

Baker teaches a speech recognition system with a graphic user interface with a window that contains a word choice history window that allows the user to choose alternate text selections from a previously spoken word (col. 1, line 48 to col. 2, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to contain a list of alternative text selections for a previously spoken word for which a speech-recognition operation has been performed as taught by Baker because this would give the user choices to facilitate the correction of misrecognized speech.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Grant et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0249640A1) teaches that using a single window in an interface provides an interface that is comfortable to the user by preventing the occurrence of distracting windows from appearing. Roth et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2005/0049880A1) teaches giving alternate text selections to the user in a single window interface. Brooks et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/016916A1) teaches a single window voice interaction interface.

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2655

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J Sked whose telephone number is (571) 272-7627. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L Ometz can be reached on (571)272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MS
05/05/05



DAVID L. OMETZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER